

**Adams, Hope**

---

**From:** Butler, David  
**Sent:** Friday, April 1, 2022 8:47 AM  
**To:** Scott Elliott; Grube-Lybarker, Carri; Charles L. A. Terreni; Parker, Connor; Hall, Roger; Knowles, Alex; Rhaney, Donna L; John J. Pringle, Jr.; vsheheen@thesavagefirm.com  
**Cc:** Wheat, Jo; PSC\_Contact; Moser, Sandra; Stark, David  
**Subject:** Settlement Hearing Set for April 4, 2022 AT 10 am - Procedure - Question on an Exhibit for ORS, Hipp-4

To the Parties:

First, I wanted to let you know that the Chairman is agreeable to the Order of Procedure proposed by the Parties for the Settlement hearing, that is, in order of appearance, the Town of Kiawah Island, the Department of Consumer Affairs, Office of Regulatory Staff, and Kiawah Island Utility, Incorporated.

I did have one question that is not a major one, yet, is one of concern. The Commission received a letter from ORS on February 24, 2022, discussing, among other things, Exhibits Hipp-1 and Hipp-4, and the fact that the exhibits bear the designation "confidential." The letter goes on to explain that these designations appear on publicly-filed versions and the documents are not actually "confidential." Of course, now, although there was some Hipp testimony designated confidential, my understanding is that Ms. Hipp's testimony is now entirely public. As I understand it, however, on the revised exhibits, the "CONFIDENTIAL" notation still appears at the top of page one, Exhibit Hipp-1; and once again at the top of page 29, Exhibit Hipp-4 (last page of the exhibit packet). I also understand that these designations were on the original Company documents received by ORS, but the Company now agrees that the documents in question are not confidential. The problem that Commission Staff has is that we believe that use of the present documents marked "confidential" is going to cause confusion for anyone researching exhibits on the Commission's Document Management System at a later time. An outside researcher will simply not understand why documents marked "confidential" appear in a public format on the DMS. For this reason, I am wondering if perhaps ORS could somehow furnish revised exhibits without the "confidential" designation? This would be with the Company's permission, of course. Commission Staff believes that filing revised versions would alleviate any possible confusion for researchers as to whether or not the documents are actually confidential. Anything you can do to help solve this issue, would be greatly appreciated. Thank you in advance for your consideration in this matter.

Regards,  
 David Butler  
 Chief Hearing Officer  
 Special Counsel